

REMARKS

Applicants have thoroughly considered the Examiner's remarks in the October 2, 2006 Office action and have amended the application to more clearly set forth the invention. This Amendment A amends claims 1, 5, 8, 13, 15, 22, 30, 31, and 34. Claims 1-34 are thus presented in the application for further examination. Reconsideration of the application as amended and in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,058,671 to Calvo et al. (Calvo) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,745,238 to Giljum (Giljum). Applicants respectfully disagree. None of the cited references, alone or in combination, teach or suggest the combination of elements in claims 1-34.

Calvo teaches a method for delivering dynamic web pages. A view template has data tags instructing where and how to include each record of a query result into a server computer. Queries are performed on a **single database**. The query results are inserted into the view template to create a web page. The web page is sent to the client. (Calvo, Abstract). Giljum discloses a web publishing system where content is provided by content providers to a web site database. **The web site database stores the content from the content providers.** The web site database publishes the content stored therein on a web page. (Giljum, Abstract).

In contrast, the present invention, as claimed in amended independent claim 1, includes a template having display areas (e.g., frames). Each display area has a reference (e.g., a hyperlink) associated therewith via a display area identifier. **The reference identifies content from a content provider, with the content being hosted by the content provider.** This enables the content provider to update or modify the content without having to update the reference or otherwise notify the system of the present invention. (See paragraphs [0045], [0046]). In addition, the content provider has an identifier associated therewith. **The reference, the display area identifier, and the content provider identifier are associated with a document created from the template.**

This is completely different from the cited references. At the very least, neither Calvo nor Giljum discloses a reference identifying content from a content provider. In fact, the cited

art teaches away from the present invention by disclosing a system for *submitting* content and web site components for storage and publication by a web site system. In addition, the cited art fails to disclose a content provider identifier being associated with the document.

Aspects of the claimed invention enable cobranding on a web site while eliminating the need for extensive infrastructure at a central location for physically hosting elements for the other sites. For example, claimed aspects minimize the burden of hosting content at a centralized site such as in Giljum, improve the security of cobranded pages, ease the development and debugging of cobranding content, and enable flexible internationalization of cobranding.

The teachings of Calvo and Giljum, alone or in combination, fail to render obvious the subject matter claimed in amended claim 1. Independent claims 8, 15, 22, and 30 at least include limitations similar to independent claim 1. As such, the rejection of claims 1, 8, 15, 22, and 30 should be removed.

Applicants submit that the claims depending from the independent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons that the independent claims from which they depend are allowable.

Regarding claim 2 in particular, responsive to a request for a document, the references to content (e.g., a hyperlinks) are retrieved and inserted into a document (e.g., a web page). A web browser or other application program rendering the document operates to retrieve, from the content provider, the content specified by the references. (See paragraph [0049] and FIG. 5). None of the cited art discloses or suggests such limitations. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claim 2 should be removed.

Conclusion

Applicants submit that the claims are allowable for at least the reasons set forth herein. Applicants thus respectfully submit that claims 1-34 as presented are in condition for allowance and respectfully request favorable reconsideration of this application.

Although the prior art made of record and not relied upon may be considered pertinent to the disclosure, none of these references anticipates or makes obvious the recited aspects of the invention. The fact that Applicants may not have specifically traversed any particular assertion by the Office should not be construed as indicating Applicants' agreement therewith.

Applicants wish to expedite prosecution of this application. If the Examiner deems the application to not be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited and encouraged to telephone the undersigned to discuss making an Examiner's amendment to place the application in condition for allowance.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency or overpayment of any required fee during the entire pendency of this application to Deposit Account No. 19-1345.

Respectfully submitted,

/James J. Barta, Jr./

James J. Barta, Jr., Reg. No. 47,409
SENNIGER POWERS
One Metropolitan Square, 16th Floor
St. Louis, Missouri 63102
(314) 231-5400

JJB/cjl